THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII MARCH, 1960 No. 477

Editorial

"WORKER-PRIESTS", "priest-workmen", "supplementary clergy", "voluntary clergy", "priesthood of the laity", etc., are terms often to be met in current Christian literature. They can be very confusing because of the different interests that encourage their use. It was a good idea on the part of Mr Robin Denniston to assemble a collection of essays and articles from writers who have given thought to one or more aspects of the subject and who in some cases have engaged in experimental action. The resulting symposium, entitled *Part Time Priests*,[1] is not the product of concerted discussion among the contributors, though in a few instances they evidently knew what some of the others were going to say. At first sight, the book may add to the confusion, not so much because of the plain disagreements it contains, as because under one general title quite disparate questions are considered. Readers should however be moved to draw some obvious distinctions.

There is first the question whether it is going to be possible for the Church of England to go on working its parochial system with only full-time professional clergymen and such assistance as is at present given by lay helpers. We should have thought that the statistics adduced by the Bishop of Southwell in the opening essay on "The Case for Part-time Priests" answers this question decisively in the negative. But the Bishop of Bath and Wells who follows appears to be unconvinced. He says he believes that men of the traditional kind to maintain the parochial system "are available, and will be forthcoming if the call to them is clear enough and compelling enough". On the evidence, this seems to be a piece of wishful thinking. If the parochial system, including the ministry of the Sacraments as well as of the Word, is to be maintained, we do not see how it is going to be done without the ordination of part-time priests. (Several essayists make the captious point that there can no more be a part-time priest than a part-time Christian: but the epithet is reasonably applied to priests who devote only part of their time to the employments that have become characteristic of clergymen.)

It is important to decide whether the ministry of the Sacraments is or is not normal, if not indispensable, in every local church. Roland Allen, who (as Mr David Paton points out) stated the case for "Voluntary Clergy" many years ago, said: "Wherever . . . an altar is set up, wherever a congregation is gathered, there the Church should be in its fulness, that it members may live the life of the Church, not in a maimed or partial form but in its fullness." Likewise, the Bishop of Hong Kong, who explains what has been done

[1] Skeffington. 1960. 16s.

in his diocese, writes: "Our need is for regular and reverent celebration of the Lord's Supper, so that the people may receive the Holy Communion regularly and *from the hands of someone who knows them and belongs to them*" (italics ours). Mr Nicholas Mosley, on the other hand, with England evidently in mind, says that "there is scarcely yet a crisis of overwork in the matters which only priests can handle and laymen can't—in the administration of the Sacraments". But there is already a crisis if we are thinking in terms of local churches with a full sacramental life. The Bishop of Bath and Wells seems to miss this point when he says: "Let us consider by all means ways in which the sacramental life of the Church may be more easily ministered, either by the restoration of the Order of Deacon . . . or by an extended permission to readers to administer the chalice". But how shall they administer the chalice if there be no priest in the local community to consecrate it?

Secondly, there is the question whether it is not to be desired that there should be, so far as possible, more than one priest in each parish or local congregation and a variety of other ordained or commissioned ministers as well. This is the claim made by the Bishop of Michigan in one of the most arresting essays in the book. He points out that both Roman Catholicism and the fundamentalist sects have a very much larger ministry than Anglicanism, both in quantity and in variety. He tells what his own diocese has been doing to overcome the "one-man army assumption" that Anglicanism makes. Other essayists from other angles argue for an enlargement of our concept of ministry in the Church. Under this heading a great deal more is at stake than providing scope for part-time *priests*.

Thirdly, there is the question whether it is not an advantage for parish priests to work in secular jobs so that they meet people and get to know them in the most natural way where they are, instead of waiting for them to come within the present confines of the Church. This is the point of an essay by Mr John Bickersteth on "Priests turned Workmen".[1]

Fourthly, there is the question whether there should not be in our society an extensive ministry of ordained priests and other ministers beyond or alongside the parochial system. "Our exclusive preoccupation with the parochial system as the norm of priestly life," writes Mr Moelwyn Merchant, "is dangerously misleading, a survival of the days when Great Britain was Christian, with the parish church as the focal point in a regular established order."

Fifthly, some of the essayists, notably Mr Mosley, are concerned with the question how the *layman* can live a fully Christian life in the contemporary world. Would it not help some of them at least to be ordained to a priestly or other ministry? Mr Mosley, we think rightly, has come to the conclusion that it is not in this direction that the solution of his problem is to be found.

We hope that this book will be widely discussed, but we recommend that the different questions which it raises be distinguished as

[1] See also his article in THEOLOGY, January 1959, pp. 24–7.

clearly as possible. Granted that there should be part-time priests, other questions follow. Should they be "equal in authority and commission with . . . full-time priests" (p. 14), or would it be necessary to have two forms of Ordinal (p. 18)? How should they be trained? See "Training the New Men" by Mr Bernard Mayes. How should the experiment be started—or extended, for it has already been started? The Archbishop of York agrees with the Bishop of Michigan in thinking that it will happen from below, not by waiting for a collective decision from above.

Fewer Missionary Societies?

Some of the literature we incumbents have received recently from the various missionary societies makes challenging reading. Although in some parts of the world all missionary activity is forbidden, yet there is general agreement that doors are open and opportunities are available for real missionary advance. The trouble is that there is an absence of sustained and sacrificial giving and informed prayer support that together make modern missionary work little more than a holding action in field after field.

We incumbents are the key figures in the situation. There are over ten thousand of us, and our lead to our parishes will decide the issue one way or the other. The Chairman of the Overseas Council and the General Secretaries of the eleven recognized missionary societies clearly realize this, and thus they recently addressed to us a letter which included a declaration of the need and a powerful plea for support "on a scale and with a degree of sacrificial backing never before envisaged or attempted".

The trouble is that we have so many other commitments. Our own church expenses have to be given priority, and the cost of heating and repairs and maintenance generally has increased by a greater rate than have ordinary collections. We like to improve our churches as opportunity offers by installing bigger and better organs and by adding more bells and by putting in furnishings of really excellent quality to replace things that are clearly seen to be shoddy and second rate. Kneelers and books and choir robes and frontals and so on have to be replaced from time to time. Diocesan quotas have to be paid. We are reminded of the need for building churches and halls and parsonage houses in the new housing areas. Help is needed by retired clergy and clergy widows. We have some responsibility for church schools and church training-colleges. All these things are brought constantly to our notice in a variety of ways and it is hardly surprising that when a diocesan bishop makes an appeal it is rare for items outside the diocese to be given any sort of mention. The claims of the Church overseas can easily be squeezed out and we can, and in many cases do, get away with only token support, giving perhaps one collection per year and the contents of a few boxes to the society of our choice. The figures for 1956 revealed by the Official

Year-Book statistics are pretty shattering. The total income of our parishes from all sources was £17,281,000 and of this we spent 86·2 per cent on our own parochial needs and only 3·1 per cent was given to the work of the Church overseas. Put in another way, each communicant gave 4s. 7d. per head per year to overseas missions, roughly the cost of one ounce of tobacco or one gallon of petrol.

We are not happy about this, however, and we try to find excuses. We tell ourselves that if only people would give far more generously then we should be able to find money for all the wonderful things that we would like to do, but we know only too well that the giving in most of our parishes is deplorably low. More figures from the 1959 Official Year-Book show that our total income amounts to about 2s. 10d. per week from each Easter Communicant, but, as many non-communicants contribute, it is clear that the average worshipper is responsible for a very much smaller amount than this; nor is this figure based on direct giving. Not much less than half of our total income comes from fêtes and bazaars and jumble-sales and all sorts of rather undignified ways of raising money indirectly. It seems clear that the average adult worshipper contributes a good deal less than 1s. per week. It is now known that careful teaching and professional know-how can raise standards of giving far beyond this pathetically inadequate standard, and great numbers of parishes have now had professional fund-raising campaigns that have astonished incumbent and people alike, and the usual result is to double or triple the existing direct giving. It might be supposed that in these parishes the amount allocated for overseas missionary work would be very greatly increased, but the figures published by the missionary societies contain no indication that this is in fact happening. The biggest of all of them asked for an extra £30,000 in 1958, but only got £8,000 of it. It does not seem to follow that the greatly increased incomes that many Parochial Church Councils are now enjoying lead automatically to increased support for the Church overseas.

The trouble seems to lie rather deeper than just pressure of other commitments. We try to convince ourselves that the missionary societies themselves are not spending the money properly and that their methods of administration are too costly and out of date. The opinion is being fairly commonly expressed that the whole missionary society system is behind the times and out of keeping with modern tendencies. It seems to many that the present system merely perpetuates differences of ecclesiastical colour that no longer mean as much as they used to mean. We tell ourselves that if we could see evidence of a movement towards unity and the establishing of one really efficient Church of England missionary society, then we could encourage our people to give far more generously than they have ever done before.

At first sight our present system is clearly indefensible. Think of it—eleven separate and distinct missionary societies officially recognized by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly in addition to sixty-one auxiliaries that include forty-three diocesan associations. Here is a list of the officially recognized societies:

Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society.
Church Missions to Jews.
Church Missionary Society.
Commonwealth and Continental Church Society.
Jerusalem and the East Mission.
Melanesian Mission.
Missions to Seamen.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.
South American Missionary Society.
Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

Each has a London headquarters, with rent and rates and heating and lighting and repair bills. Each has to meet the costs of printing and postage. Each has a headquarters' staff of secretaries and clerks and typists, and there are area-secretaries overlapping each other in all parts of the country. It is possible to say flatly that the system is not working properly because it cannot and does not deserve to do so. It is possible to make out a case for scrapping the whole thing, and demanding one huge missionary society, housed in a gigantic building, equipped with every labour-saving device, and a model of slick and streamlined efficiency. It is possible to say that the Church of Scotland and the Methodist Church do not find the need for separate societies, and that what they can do we can do. It is possible to get quite excited about the whole subject, and to make this excitement a substitute for the sacrificial support that we are asked to give.

Those of us who have talked to front-line missionaries home on furlough have been surprised to find that they are the very ones who most emphatically do not want any such change. They, the living agents who do the actual job, are surely the ones whose feelings on this matter must be carefully weighed. Here is an extract from a letter recently received from one of them:

> As I said to you when we talked, I think the suggestion of one vast Anglican society is a perfectly monstrous suggestion. As a working missionary with some experience of administration myself, I just don't believe it could possibly keep the personal links which are the essence of what we want, and that we get in the fellowship of our Society. It would develop into a vast soulless machine; some small saving would be achieved by streamlining and lack of duplication at home but the loss, intangible though it might be, would far outweigh the gain.

A report called *Growing Together*, produced by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly in 1950, examines carefully the suggestion that unification should be carried to its logical conclusion and a sub-committee produced a blue-print of a scheme based on the hypothesis that the Church had assumed direct corporate responsibility for all its work overseas. It contains some formidable proposals. Ultimate responsibility would rest with the Church Assembly, who would form an Overseas Board for formulating policy, assigning priorities, allocating funds and maintaining relations with overseas provinces. This unification would virtually supersede the multiple missionary societies which would merely become fellowships of

prayer and service. The details of the scheme are all given at length, but the Commission unanimously rejected the proposals in favour of a continuance of the present system. They did so on the grounds that the change is desired neither by supporters at home nor by the missionaries in the field nor by the congregations overseas. As the Report puts it, "to merge, or even to propose to merge, the identity of the societies in a unitary organization would cause dismay which might seriously impair the work". No doubt much evidence was obtained to support this viewpoint, and it is certainly true that at no time has there been any very great enthusiasm in the Church of England for more centralization, more bureaucracy, for more of that tendency which in politics leads to totalitarianism and in business to cartels and monopolies. Nobody really wants to see the Church Assembly indulging in a series of take-over bids, and there is a fear that the cold hand of death might thereby descend upon bodies that, whatever else may be said, are alive and virile at the present time.

The Church of England is quite different from any other Church. We include in our membership those who, at the one extreme, would like to see us move towards Rome, and those who, at the other extreme, regard Methodists as having long ago reached the ideal for which we should be striving. Feelings are not as strong as they used to be, but they are there, and the advocates of the extreme positions are often more missionary-minded than the moderates. They feel that organic union would inevitably mean that minority theological viewpoints would get crowded out and they are probably right. One great Church of England missionary society would tend to express the majority point of view both in the secretariat and in any committees which were subject to election by the majority. The plain fact is that complete unification is neither desired nor possible and the result, if it was forced through, might be spiritually tragic with the last state infinitely worse than the first.

The possibility of reducing the number of missionary societies must now be considered, and it is appreciated that this is a highly delicate subject because each society commands a measure of affectionate regard and nobody wants to see any society go out of existence. It is easy enough to plead for a reduction in general terms. It is far more difficult to make concrete suggestions. Take a look at the list of the eleven officially recognized societies. Which ones would you say ought to survive and which should be absorbed? Who should take over whom?

Some societies are not missionary societies at all in the accepted sense of the word. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge handed over its direct missionary work to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel as long ago as 1701, and makes the production and distribution of literature its principal function. The Missions to Seamen deals with the welfare of sailors the world over. The Commonwealth and Continental Church Society was founded to serve emigrants from the British Isles overseas, and now mostly caters for English-speaking people in chaplaincies. Obviously these three must be left out of any unification scheme.

That leaves eight. Of these the Big Two are the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. It is unlikely that these would ever want to combine because there are differences both of method and of churchmanship. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel does practically all its work by supporting dioceses and working through the diocesan bishops, whereas the Church Missionary Society sends out men and women who continue in close relation with the Society and who rely on the fellowship that is maintained by close touch with London Headquarters and on the pastoral supervision that is exercised by the chief secretaries, and the C.M.S. is predominately Evangelical in tone, whereas the S.P.G. is supported by many parishes that would call themselves Anglo-Catholic. But both rely on parishes of central churchmanship for a great deal of support.

The Universities Mission to Central Africa is the focal point for extreme Anglo-Catholic support. A case might be made out for U.M.C.A. amalgamating with S.P.G., not least because U.M.C.A. is confined to a part of one great continent and has no world-wide commitments. But here again differencies of method and churchmanship must be considered. U.M.C.A. sends out missionaries who, with few exceptions, are celibate and receive no salaries beyond their keep and pocket money. S.P.G. would not want their organization to be given a more pronounced Anglo-Catholic bias by this accession to their ranks, and there is obviously a very strong case for one definite Anglo-Catholic society.

If there is a case for keeping a society representing one extreme separate from the others, then an equally clear case could be made out for a distinctively Conservative Evangelical society remaining separate too. The Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society represents this other definite minority point of view, a point of view that appears to be increasing steadily. This society has world-wide commitments and it would not be right to absorb this outlet for enthusiastic support. It just would not do to compel this society to join forces with, say, C.M.S.

We are left with the Melanesian Mission, the Jerusalem and the East Mission, the South American Missionary Society and the Church Mission to Jews. Just why the first two of these were given official recognition is not very clear, because both are really diocesan associations rather than missionary societies, and both should therefore be removed from the list. The South American Missionary Society is one of the smallest and is the only missionary society at work in South America. It is disturbing to read that this society has initiated efforts to affiliate with one of the larger societies, with a view to enlarging the scope of its work and reducing its heavy overhead expenses, but that this has not come to fruition. As this society is strictly Evangelical, it is presumably C.M.S. or B.C.M.S. that have failed to respond to this, and it would be interesting to know the reasons why. It is quite clear that the South American Missionary Society ought to be taken over, particularly in view of the growing scope of the work that desperately needs to be done.

The Church Mission to Jews is the only Anglican society for the diffusion of Christianity among the Jews, and it is difficult to see how any of the larger societies could take over this work. Yet this work is of the very first importance. But need it continue to be one of the officially recognized missionary societies? It does highly specialized work, and confines its work to only one category of people, and it is thus to be considered on the same level as the Missions to Seamen and the other specialized societies.

This brings us to the conclusion that there should be a Big Four—the Universities Mission to Central Africa (extreme Anglo-Catholic), the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (Anglo-Catholic and Central churchmanship), the Church Missionary Society (Evangelical and Central churchmanship) and the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society (Conservative Evangelical). These should be the only officially recognized major missionary societies. All the others would come under the heading of "Specialized Societies" or "Auxiliaries" or "Associates".

The existing list of societies officially recognized by the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly is divided into three schedules. The first consists of the eleven recognized societies, the second consists of the various federations, religious communities and diocesan associations included under the general heading of "Auxiliaries" and the third includes various societies such as the British and Foreign Bible Society, under the heading of "Associates". The new proposed list would read as follows:

SCHEDULE I. MAJOR SOCIETIES.

Universities' Mission to Central Africa.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
Church Missionary Society.
Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society.

SCHEDULE II. SPECIALIZED SOCIETIES.

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
Commonwealth and Continental Church Society.
Missions to Seamen.
Church Missions to Jews.

SCHEDULE III. AUXILIARIES.

Various Federations.
Religious Communities.
Diocesan Associations.

SCHEDULE IV. ASSOCIATES.

British and Foreign Bible Society, etc.

There would be very great advantages in seeing the number of major missionary societies reduced to four, not least because it would remove the general feeling that at present there are far too many and that there is much too much overlapping. Every parish in the land should be urged to support one or other of the Big Four and the choice surely covers every conceivable shade of churchman-

ship. This would certainly mean very much greater support for the four main societies, but it need not lead to less and less support for the smaller ones because parishes would be urged to select at least one from schedules two, three and four, and give generous support to that as well. But the main effort in each parish would be devoted to one of the Big Four, and this would involve far more than just the giving of money, vitally important though this is.

In my parish we support the Church Missionary Society. We encourage our people to take the monthly magazine *The Outlook* and our children to take *The Discoverer*. We have our Own Missionary, a priest working amongst Chinese in Malaya, and he sends us personal letters from time to time that are circulated amongst our people. We pray for him by name every Sunday at the Family Communion, and when we had a Parochial Mission it was an inspiring thought that his Chinese Christians were praying for us. We make use of C.M.S. information services, making regular use of photographs and film strips. The Parochial Church Council has formed a Missionary Committee, every member of which is a member of C.M.S. and as such receives literature direct from Headquarters. We discuss questions posed by C.M.S. Headquarters and we forward our points to our local association and thus help to brief a London representative who attends the quarterly C.M.S. Central Committee meetings. We have had a Wells' Campaign that improved our direct giving out of all knowledge and 10 per cent of all our pledged giving goes to C.M.S. This I know is all too little, but at least it works out at an average of nearly £1 per Easter communicant instead of 4s. 7d. I can in fact report greatly increased interest and there is no doubt that this has resulted from concentrating our main efforts on only one society; but it should be added that we have also increased the amount we send to one of the minor societies as well.

Any parish that decided to support one of the Big Four would receive all the help it needed to make that support informed and prayerful and thoroughly exciting, and it would not be long before this concentration of effort would help to bring about that "degree of sacrificial backing never before envisaged or attempted". I do not believe that the elevation of the Big Four above all the others would lead to less support for the smaller societies because missionary enthusiasm, once kindled, is something that spreads rapidly. The smaller societies should know that the increased giving that is now being seen in parish after parish must lead to greater support for them as well and they, with the bigger ones, should plan boldly for future expansion. The professional fund-raising organizations urge parishes to try to give away half of their total income, and although this may be just a remote ideal at present, yet it can be said that with the passing of the years far more is going to be given to the work of the Church overseas. We incumbents can be relied upon to play our part, but a number of us feel strongly that there are at present too many major societies. The number could be reduced to four and a much tidier picture would emerge.

MICHAEL HOCKING.

Stewardship Sets Us Thinking

SINCE Brian Rice introduced the subject in THEOLOGY (September 1957), Christian Stewardship has become a familiar topic in churches throughout Britain. Stewardship Campaigns are becoming everyday occurrences, parishes all over the country are re-thinking their attitude towards giving, and dioceses are beginning to realize that this movement is one which must be fostered and directed "at the top". And certain features of the Anglican scene are being illuminated as all this happens. We are starting to look closely at some of our cherished ideas and practices, and are not a little exercised in mind by what we see. In effect we are having to provide an answer to two fundamental questions—first, how do we think of the Church? and, secondly, what is the true nature of Christian giving? And these are questions which are now seen to hang together.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century the Church of England had to adjust itself to a new pattern of parish finance. It was assumed that certain items were necessary expenditure—chiefly the running expenses of the church building, the payment of curates, vergers and organists, and so forth. To meet this expenditure it became customary to devote the great majority of the collections taken during church services—often in defiance of the rubric in the Communion Service, although there was a deferential nod in its direction when the "eight o'clock" collection was given to the Vicar's "Sick and Poor" Fund. This payment for "Church Expenses" was obviously necessary, and a small contribution from everyone was as a rule sufficient to pay all the bills. In another category altogether came the "good causes"—notably the "Home and Overseas Missions" of the Church, and nationally accepted charities which found in church people sympathetic and often generous subscribers. For these good causes definite "appeals" would be made—appeals quite frankly to the emotions as well as to the intellect. Special sermons would be preached from time to time in aid of these "charities", and the ensuing collections given to their funds. In addition, groups of enthusiasts for different charities would be found in most parishes, who would seek to foster interest in their particular causes and who would themselves organize "efforts", from socials to sewing parties, in aid of them. It would probably be too much to claim that charity began outside the parish and duty applied inside it; but clearly everyone assumed that one's own church needed to be maintained while for other causes it was necessary for interest to be specially stimulated.

It would seem to have been the "Quota" which began to alter this situation. This was first of all regarded as a voluntary contribution by the parishes; it was devoted to the meeting of diocesan expenses and the more equitable sharing of the parishes' financial burdens. Gradually more and more items came to be included in the diocesan budget, notably a large sum for the expenses of the Church Assembly and the acceptance of some financial responsibility for such charitable objects as Moral Welfare. Gradually parishes came to accept

this assessment which the diocese made of their financial responsibility to the whole diocese. The sphere of duty became extended and that of charity reduced: and the Christian in the pew began to realize that the Church was far wider than his own parish. At the same time it became less easy to meet the financial demands now made on the parish, and often "efforts", similar to those previously organized for charities, had now to be organized to balance the parish's annual budget. Interest had to be stimulated, and there was much said about the "needs" of the Church.

The parish had now come to accept its duty to the diocese, and the right of the diocese to assess the extent of that duty. It was some time before the dioceses came to accept their duty to the whole Church of England. If the parishes' Quota payments fell short of the full amount, a corresponding reduction might be made in the payment due to the Church Assembly, or to Church Training Colleges, by the diocese. And often the dioceses were diffident about including in the Quota such items of "expansion" as the provision of new churches, making these part of a semi-voluntary extra Quota—perhaps owing to nervousness about the weight of the proverbial last straw, or because there still lurked in the minds of members of Boards of Finance the distinction between duty and charity, between what one gave as a matter of course, and what one had to be stimulated to give by "appeals".

Since the war there has been a courageous effort by parishes and dioceses to put this rather muddled situation into some sort of order. It would not be too much to say that a revolution in thought has taken place. More and more we regard ourselves as members of the Church of England, and not just as parishioners of a particular church. Our responsibilities for the work of the whole Church are freely accepted—many parts of which, fifty years ago, would have been objects for which special appeals to the charity of Christian people would have been made. We now know that settled parishes must contribute to the cost of churches in new housing areas, that the Church's home mission work must be supported as a matter of duty, that the whole Church and not just "education-minded" individuals must pay for the Church's Training Colleges for teachers. No parish thinks of contracting out of a particular part of its Quota, and no diocese would dream of paying its diocesan bills first and remitting to the Central Board of Finance only the balance remaining.

We have come a long way; but there would seem to be still a long way to go. First, our attitude towards giving is still based on what we call the "needs" of the Church. This is partly a result of the increased demands made on parishes; no longer will the conventional offering suffice, but much of the money in most parishes has to be obtained by emotional stimulation of the potential givers. ("The Vicar is always begging.") Those parishes whose income is sufficient for these basic needs sit back comfortable in the knowledge that they can "pay their way". Secondly, our conception of the Church is still too narrow. It has, as we have seen, been considerably widened, so that we now realize our responsibility for the Church's

work beyond the bounds of our own parish or diocese. But we still have our "charities", causes for which our support is canvassed by the enthusiasts, and to which, if we choose, we may refuse that support altogether. Chief among these is what we tend still to call "overseas missions". Yet if it is indeed true that we are members not just of a parish, a diocese, or the Church of England, but of the Anglican Communion, it is a completely anomalous situation that parish, diocese and Church Assembly should budget for the needs of the Church as a whole but stop short at this point. A parish which disapproves of the amount of money spent on Church Training Colleges can express that disapproval only by refusing to pay its diocesan Quota: but its refusal will actually not deprive the Church Training Colleges of a penny, because the diocese as a whole has agreed to pay a certain sum for them to the Church Assembly and it is the diocese which will suffer the loss of that parish's contribution. Yet a parish which "does not believe in Missions"—and from the published figures of the Societies there would appear still to be many such—can evade its responsibilities towards this essential work of the whole Church and neither the diocese nor the Church Assembly is officially concerned about it.

The first of these points is being dealt with by the rapid spread of new ideas about stewardship. The fund-raising organizations have given us a jolt with their slogan "The need of the giver to give". Although this is too slick to be theologically true, it at least tries to convey the truth that giving is a response to the goodness of God and not to the needs of man. Obviously the work of the Church needs money; obviously money must be given to meet these needs; but the needs should not call forth the money. Each Christian family should give as much as it can each week, irrespective of the particular needs of its parish; the logical conclusion being that there is virtually no place left for the emotional appeal for a "good cause". It is noticeable, however, that most of the parishes which have organized "stewardship campaigns" have done so because of some pressing domestic need; and the necessity for a long period of education on the subject of Christian giving as a response to God's goodness and not the needs of the Church, emphasized by Brian Rice in the article already referred to, is still apparent. Moreover, a great work of educating Parochial Church Councils will have to be undertaken: increased income will tend to lead to increased parochial expenditure, not all of it justified; and the drawing up of a realistic budget will be a task which will test the spiritual resources of the P.C.C. Not only individuals, but Parochial Church Councils will have to learn the true nature of giving.

For this reason the guidance which the Church as a whole gives, whether in diocese or Church Assembly, is of vital importance, and it is very necessary that the anomalies mentioned above should be removed, and our whole conception of the Church realistically examined. Parochial Church Councils will need to be told frankly and clearly about their responsibilities for the work of the whole Church, whether at home or overseas. And this information will have to

come from Assembly and Diocese, and its implications be accepted by both. In practice it is bound to mean, for example, that diocesan quotas will be very greatly increased, and that a definite proportion of the total assessment will be set aside for the overseas work of the Church. And just as at present the dioceses honour in full their obligations to the Church Assembly, so it may be hoped that the same attitude would come to prevail towards the amount to be given to the Church overseas. It will be seen at once that the task of education in the true meaning of Christian giving will have to be extended to Bishops, members of the Church Assemby, and diocesan officials!

It may be objected that the method here advocated is that used in the U.S.A. and in the Dominions, where the Church itself is its own Missionary agency; and that the Church of England, with its many Missionary Societies and charities, would not be able to adapt itself to such a system. The basic question is not whether Missionary and other societies can be fitted in, but whether their traditional approach is realistic and theologically sound in the present situation. The two largest of our societies have just re-assessed their requirements in the urgent and challenging situations which face them overseas, in a manner which clearly demonstrates the vigour and vision of their leadership. Yet it will be fatally easy for parishes to regard this re-assessment as just an "appeal" for more money—and if they do it will almost certainly fail in its purpose. The societies have a tremendous value in that they act as clearing-houses for information and experience; and as this is what will be more and more required if the local church and the diocese and the Central Board of Finance are to be rightly guided, it may well be that this will become their main function. And we can rejoice at the recent appointment of Bishop Bayne if by it the final blow can be given to the idea that we can still rightly use the terms "home" and "overseas" when referring to the Anglican Communion.

We are moving rapidly into a new understanding of the nature of both giving and the Church. In this period of transition there is need for clear and imaginative thinking and a willingness to dispense with methods based upon ways of thought which we are leaving behind. The task of the world-wide Church today is urgent in the extreme: we dare not risk a state of chaos which will confuse the minds of those whom stewardship campaigns are bringing to a deeper understanding of their responsibility for that task.

KENNETH SKELTON.

Roman Catholic Biblical Scholarship: 1939-1960

WHEN I agreed in the latter part of 1959 to give some account of the progress of biblical scholarship in our Church throughout the years from the beginning of the Second World War until the present time, I was helped by the reflection that this was not the first time that I had essayed something of the kind. Towards the beginning of the period mentioned I contributed to the memorial volume to my

dear master of Jerusalem days, the Dominican Father Marie-Joseph Lagrange, O.P., a short essay on "Recent Catholic Exegesis in English-speaking Lands",[1] which, in the event, I did not see even in proof until the end of hostilities in 1945. Since then I have twice returned to the subject in print, once in a long notice of the *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* in the *Clergy Review* for 1953, pp. 237–69, and again in a Third Programme broadcast of 18 November 1954, which was subsequently published in *Scripture*. I shall make some references to an article by my late friend Père J. M. Vosté, O.P., secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission from 1939 until his death in 1949, entitled "Cinquante ans d'études bibliques", which appeared in the *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, October-December 1947. Père Vosté's article is in part a running commentary on Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, issued on the feast of St Jerome (30 September), 1943.

It seems better to begin my re-assessment with some remarks, *vingt ans après*, of my contribution to the *Mémorial Lagrange*, in which I was primarily concerned with progress made in English-speaking countries. I said among other things that, at the time of writing, a continental scholar who had made some study of the matter would doubtless carry away two main impressions. First, that there were many *lacunae* in our scriptural library in English, and secondly that some of the books in use were no more than translations, and not always good translations at that, from works originally published in French, German or Italian. As instances of this tendency to rely upon books from other countries I mentioned Père Lagrange's *L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ* (1928; E.T. 1938), Père J. Lebreton, S.J.'s *La Vie et l'Enseignement de Jésus-Christ, Notre Seigneur* (1931; E.T. 1934) and Père L. de Grandmaison, S.J.'s *Jésus-Christ* (1928; E.T. 1930–4). It remains true at the present time that quantities of foreign books on biblical subjects are still translated, among the latest of these being two of the chief writings of Mgr L. Cerfaux of Louvain, *Le Christ dans la théologie de Saint Paul* (1951) and *La Théologie de l'Église suivant Saint Paul* (1948). Yet there are also welcome signs that the number of original works on Holy Scripture, written by men whose native language is English, is steadily increasing.

I wrote in 1940 that: "The first and most important task of the past quarter of a century has been, and continues to be, the provision of an adequate translation of the Bible in English" (art. cit., p. 240). I pointed out then that the only complete translation in regular use was Bishop Richard Challoner's revision of the Douay Bible, and I added: "The bicentenary of the revision will be celebrated in 1949, and it is a consoling reflection that by that date, there is every prospect that the revision will have been itself thoroughly revised." Unfortunately or otherwise, this not unreasonable forecast has not, so far, been entirely realized. The American Confraternity edition of the New Testament, issued in 1941, describes

[1] *Mémorial Lagrange*, Gabalda, Paris, 1940, pp. 239–50.

itself on the title-page as "a Revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version" and as "Translated from the Latin Vulgate", but, when work on the Old Testament was begun, a decision was taken to translate direct from the originals and not to be content with the revision of the Douay Bible. The nearest approach to a revision of the Douay Bible as a whole has been the Catholic Truth Society's edition of 1956 which "provided the opportunity to make, with the sanction of authority, certain emendations, mainly of a grammatical nature, to the current Douay texts".[1]

At the time when war broke out in 1939 the only alternative to the Douay Bible was the "Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures", under the general editorship of Fathers of the Society of Jesus. In the years between 1913 and 1935 a complete text of the New Testament, translated from the original Greek, was produced in four imposing volumes, with a good deal of introductory matter and reasonably full notes. In 1948 there appeared a one-volume New Testament, containing the whole of the text, but a much reduced set of notes. It is sad to relate that, in the quarter of a century that has elapsed since the Westminster New Testament was completed, very little headway has been made with the Old Testament. The late Fr Lattey's edition of *Daniel* was brought out in 1948, and Fr Sebastian Bullough, O.P.'s *Obadiah, Micah. Zephaniah, Haggai and Zechariah* in 1953, but not more than a dozen books of the Old Testament have been published over the whole period since 1935.

It is pleasant to reflect that another English version, the American "Confraternity edition", has made remarkable progress in its Old Testament sections since the New Testament appeared in 1941. After a preliminary issue of one or two separate books, a volume containing the Old Testament books from Genesis to Ruth saw the light in 1952 with the general title: *The Holy Bible translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources.* One of the features of this edition was a lengthy series of textual notes at the end of the volume, in which all departures from the Massoretic text were set out in detail. In reviewing this volume for the Society of Old Testament Studies' *Book List* for 1953 I was able to state that: "This translation, as a work of literature, does not seem to be quite in the front rank, but there is plenty of evidence that no pains have been spared to achieve a readable and accurate rendering" (p. 33). Three years later, in 1955, Vol. III, containing the sapiential books (Job to Sirach), came from the press, but it was not regarded by some reviewers as wholly satisfactory. Thus Professor D. Winton Thomas in the *Book List* for 1956 (pp. 24–5) wrote of it: "The textual notes which cover fifty closely printed pages, indicate that considerable care has been taken to provide an accurate translation. Yet there are many passages where a fuller acquaintance with recent philological work would have resulted in a different, and superior translation. The translation too is somewhat less elegant than it might be. The volume is, however, a substantial work of

[1] See the publisher's note, printed on the reverse of the title-page.

critical scholarship which the student of these Wisdom books will find it worthwhile to consult." It is understood that the last volume, containing the prophetic literature, has for long been in active preparation and will be published in the not too distant future.

One may now turn to the last of the post-war translations into English, namely the late Mgr Ronald Knox's *The Holy Bible: A Translation from the Latin Vulgate in the Light of the Hebrew and Greek Originals.* The one-volume definitive edition was issued in 1955, but the work had been begun in 1939 and could well be described in the dedication to Cardinal Griffin as: *Hoc opus negotium plenum vigiliarum et sudoris.* The sub-title deserves to be carefully noted, since there has been some misunderstanding about the decision to make the translation from the Vulgate Latin. While the work was in progress, and indeed before much had been done on the Old Testament, I received a suggestion from an influential quarter in Rome that Mgr Knox might prefer to make his Old Testament version from the original texts. I passed on the proposal to my old friend, but he chose to disregard it. None the less, as even a short study of his notes to the text will show, he frequently gives reference to changes made in the light of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts.

It does not seem necessary to say very much about Mgr Knox's translation, since it is already so well known. I notice that, in the article mentioned above, Père Vosté quotes from a letter I sent him, bearing date of 23 June 1944, in which I wrote: "One of the chief objections to it, frequently raised while it was in the making, was that, at times, it is *more a paraphrase than a translation.*" (Art. cit., p. 205*, n. 39.) On the other hand, in a very recent number of the *Journal of Semitic Studies* (1959, p. 359), Professor Matthew Black, in a review of the Revised Standard Version's edition of the Old Testament Apocrypha, says of this work that "since the Revised Version was the basis of the revision, something of its scholarly precision is also retained". But, he adds: "One does not find anything of the raciness and vigour of the late Monsignor Ronald Knox's paraphrastic version of the Apocrypha." Study groups have reported that the book reads aloud very well. The material success of the version was one in which its maker declined to share. Readers may be referred to Evelyn Waugh's *Ronald Knox* at p. 273.

The increase and the marked improvement in the versions available in English have been one of the most consoling features of the post-war years. For the sake of completeness it should be said that other countries have shown the same tendency to multiply versions. In France, in addition to Canon Osty's admirable translation of the New Testament, three complete editions of the Bible have become well established, and are styled by M. Roger Aubert in *La Théologie catholique au milieu du XXe Siècle*,[1] la "Bible de Maredsous", la "Bible de Lille", and la "Bible de Jérusalem"; in Italy the Pontifical Biblical Institute has sponsored a version now issued in eight

[1] Casterman, Paris, 1954. I. Le Renouveau Biblique, p. 11, n. 2.

volumes, *La Sacra Bibbia, tradotta dai Testi Originali*; in Spain two editions were re-published in 1957, one *La Sagrada Biblia* of Bover and Cantera in its fourth edition; the other, that of Nácar-Colunga in its seventh edition. In Germany the text of the *Echter Bibel* has found a wide public, and, most recently, a new edition of the New Testament by Otto Karrer has appeared.

So far I have written mostly about versions, but I must now turn to the matter of commentaries. In the contribution to the *Mémorial Lagrange* in 1940 I expressed the view that: "In the first place, . . . we need a really thorough one-volume commentary on all the books in the canon of Scripture. . . . This is the first and most essential requirement . . ." (p. 244). I repeated this opinion at the Catholic Conference of Ecclesiastical Studies at its Cambridge meeting held in Easter Week, 1942, and from that moment, it may be said, the project began to take shape until, in the early part of 1953, the present splendid volume, edited by Dom Bernard Orchard, O.S.B., headmaster of St Benedict's School, Ealing, appeared as the realization of ten years of hard work and careful revision. It has now been for nearly seven years in the hands of the public, and upwards of thirty thousand copies have been sold at four guineas apiece. The handsome crimson covers of the volume contain more than twelve hundred pages of text, an index of just eighty pages, and sixteen pages of maps. Each page of the text carries some thirteen hundred words, and the total number of words in the main body of the work may be estimated at about one million, six hundred thousand. In a cordial review, published in the *Book List* of the Society for Old Testament Study (1953, pp. 35–6) the late Professor T. W. Manson of beloved memory declared that: "This large and learned work may be regarded as the most impressive result, so far, of the fresh encouragement and impetus given to Roman Catholic Biblical studies by the recent pronouncements of the Pope himself and of the Pontifical Biblical Commission." The forty and more scholars (actually forty-three in all) have, writes Dr Manson, "succeeded in compressing a vast deal of factual information and doctrinal instruction into the available space". He refers to "the general impression made by the writers" as "one of cautious advance and of readiness to leave the way open for further investigation", and concludes: "The work as a whole should be of great use to both Catholics and Protestants."

At the close of my own review, already mentioned in the first lines of this article, I attempted a reply to two questions, of which the first was: Is the new volume entirely up to date? I stated that, in my opinion, after allowance had been made for the inevitable time-lag between the final editorial corrections and the appearance of the finished work, the book might be regarded as entirely and commendably up to date. In my broadcast of 18 November 1954 I was able to add that "already the volume has proved of the greatest value to our students for the priesthood in theological colleges and religious houses. They and their professors alike now have at hand a book that has largely done away with dictated notes or hectographed

sheets." It is already an established fact that the superiors of some houses of study have made it their business to see that every candidate for Holy Orders is provided with a copy of his own that may remain in his keeping long after his years of preparatory study are over.

Occasionally, it is true, one meets with the criticism that help has not been forthcoming with a particular verse, but no doubt this criticism would apply to Dummelow, Peake, and other one-volume commentaries, which assuredly cannot entirely take the place of more detailed studies. None the less, at a time when the cost of even a small scriptural library is a very serious item, this commentary, which is relatively inexpensive, makes it possible for a student to read any book of the Bible with the help of adequate introductory matter and comment, and this is a truly enormous benefit.

What, then, is the present position with regard to the planning and writing of commentaries on individual books of Holy Scripture? In my broadcast in 1954 I said: "I must quite frankly admit that we have, even now, all too few commentaries in English of the type represented by Mgr Boylan's useful work entitled: *St Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Translation and Commentary*, published by Gill of Dublin in 1934." This commentary has now been available for a quarter of a century and has been widely praised for its clarity and balanced judgments. It does not profess to be a history of the many books that have been written about *Romans* in the course of the centuries. Its author has stated that his chief aim has been "to set forth as clearly as possible the thought of St Paul". In it the linguistic arguments and the interpretation of the text are alike set out with competence and distinction, and it may be claimed that no earlier work on the Epistle that is of real value has been left out of account. It is the more regrettable that, even now, we have so few works in English of this type, and that anything like a complete series of commentaries at this high level appears, at the moment, to be unprocurable in English.

In the absence of a complete series it is to be recorded that the late Mgr Edward Kissane, for many years President of St Patrick's College, Maynooth, was able to produce in the years between 1939 and 1954 a one-volume commentary on Job, two volumes on Isaiah (1941–3) and two volumes on the Psalms (1953–4). All these were solid, informative works, not at all in the rare first-class among commentaries (not to be compared, for example, with Dhorme's *Le Livre de Job* or *Jesaia I and II* by O. Procksch and P. Volz in Sellin's *Kommentar z.A.T.*, published in 1930–2), but still an achievement, and this the more so since the Isaiah volumes appeared in the midst of the last war. Unhappily the philological element in all these volumes was reduced to a few select readings on each section. Apart from these books by Mgr Kissane, not much has been done to add to the list of full-sized commentaries in English by Roman Catholic authors.

If one turns from English-speaking lands to the continent of Europe, it becomes evident that more has been attempted, especially in France, Germany and Italy. In France the well-known twelve-

volumes series *La Sainte Bible*, published by Letouzey and Ané from 1934 onwards and edited originally by Canon L. Pirot of Lille and more recently by Professor A. Clamer of Strasbourg, has been virtually completed by the issue in 1955 of Clamer's *Exode*. It may have been an error of judgment to print the text of the Vulgate above the French translation based on the original texts, but, in spite of this uneconomical use of valuable space, the commentaries on the various books are reasonably adequate, if one takes into account their authors' intention to cater mainly for those who are not specialists. M. Aubert in his book on *La Théologie catholique*, already mentioned, has said very well that the *Bible de Lille* "se caractérise surtout par son souci de 'décommercialiser' la vente de l'Écriture en fournissant au peuple fidèle sans intermediaire et au prix coûtant cette nourriture spirituelle . . ." (p. 12).

The long-established series of *Études Bibliques*, founded by Père Lagrange as a result of his article "Projet d'un commentaire complet de l'Écriture Sainte" in the *Revue Biblique* for 1900 (pp. 414–23), has received many valuable additions since the end of the war. Père F. M. Abel, O.P., contributed a volume that he had been preparing for many years in *Les livres des Maccabées* (1950) and his two-volume *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe* (1952), of which Mr Stewart Perowne has written in his book on *The Later Herods*: "I have followed him to the point of plagiarism; but, where a task has been perfectly performed, it would be arrogant to attempt to do it differently" (p. viii). Père B. Rigaux, O.F.M., published in 1956 his vast commentary *Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, and Père C. Spicq, O.P., has added two commentaries to his earlier writings, *Les Épîtres pastorales* (1947) and *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (1952–3), of which the latter may well be the most complete study of *Hebrews* in existence. Dr W. Manson writes that it "places the author, if not at the head, at least with Westcott, Moffatt and Michel, in the foremost rank of modern expositors". (*J.T.S.*, 1953, p. 246.) Since then there have been three splendid volumes by Père Spicq on *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament* (1958–60), surely the fullest analysis of any word in the New Testament vocabulary.

In Germany one of the most useful popular series of commentaries, the Bonn Bible, seems to have made little advance since 1939. Many of the issues appeared in the ten years preceding the outbreak of the war, and there has been no later edition of the late Dr Paul Heinisch's important *Das Buch Genesis*, published in 1930 and now out of print. One of the later volumes, published in 1940–1, is *Die Bücher Tobias, Judith, und Esther*, the work of two editors, one of them, P. Athanasius Miller, O.S.B., the present Secretary of the Biblical Commission. In 1940 there appeared an *Erganzungsband* to the Bonn Bibel, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes* by Heinisch, which has since been translated into English (*Theology of the Old Testament*, St John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota) and Italian. A comparison of the editions suggests that the Italian is the more accurate rendering. Of the original German work, Père J. van der Ploeg, O.P.,

wrote: "The book of Heinisch proves certainly to be very useful, and it is doubtless the best of its kind written by a Catholic author, but the general pattern of it is still too much borrowed from scholastic theology" (*Book List*, Soc. for O.T. Study, 1946, p. 45). A later volume by Heinisch, *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes* (1950) was translated in 1952 as *History of the Old Testament*, and contains some corrections by the author. Of the latter edition Professor H. H. Rowley writes (*Book List*, 1953, p. 26): "It rests on up-to-date scholarship and very wide reading, and the bibliographical material is excellent."

It is regrettable that, to all appearances, one of the earlier German series, *Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, published at Münster, is no longer in circulation. One of its outstanding numbers was the admirable *Das Buch Job* by the late Dr Norbert Peters, and it may safely be claimed that no later commentary (such as that of P. Paul Szczygiel, M.S.C., in the Bonn Bibel) can take the place of Dr Peters' edition of Job.

Before the war, it may be said without offence, Italy did not produce many important commentaries on the Bible, but since 1947 Mgr S. Garofalo, professor at the Propaganda College in Rome, has edited a series, *La Sacra Bibbia* (issued by Marietti) which has already furnished a number of commentaries, so far mostly on the Old Testament. The general level of competence is high, the volumes by Padre A. Penna, C.R.L., on Isaiah (1958) and Jeremiah (1952) being particularly satisfying. As in the French *Bible de Lille*, a good deal of space is taken up by the Vulgate text and an Italian translation, but the exegetical matter is abundant and well arranged.

In so short a sketch as this there is no room for much information about introductory manuals on the lines of those by S. R. Driver, A. H. McNeile and other Anglican writers. At the present time there is great need for a thorough and systematic manual for our English students, though it should be added that the introductions to the books provided in the *Catholic Commentary* is often sufficiently full. In French an excellent work appeared recently in two volumes, *Introduction à la Bible*, edited by the late M. André Robert and by M. A. Feuillet (Desclée, Paris, 1958–9). The section of the first volume devoted to "Introduction générale" is one of the best of its kind anywhere, and M. Cazelles' chapters on "La Torah ou Pentateuque" exceptionally clear and interesting in a work that is throughout full of instruction. Herder has recently published an English translation of Dr A. Wikenhauser's admirable *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*.

Among the various helps to biblical study, a useful part has been played by the *Supplément* to the *Dictionnaire de la Bible* of F. Vigouroux, which has to a great extent corrected the over-conservative tendency of the original work. Originally edited by L. Pirot, and then by A. Robert, the *Supplément* is now in the hands of H. Cazelles, professor of Old Testament exegesis at the Paris *Institut catholique*. Publication was begun in 1928, and now, thirty years later, the latest fascicle is No. 31 (Mythe—Nöldeke). It is to be hoped

though no promise has as yet been given, that the work may be concluded within the next ten years.

Although progress has been made in many departments of scriptural study, there are still (as Père Vosté noted in his article in the *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*), deficiencies in the fields of archaeology, textual criticism, and Oriental languages. The *École biblique et archéologique française* has been closely associated with much of the best archaeological work in Palestine since its foundation in 1890; more recently excellent results have been obtained by the Franciscans of the Holy Land Custody and by the Jesuits of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. Even so, the extent of these excavations does not compare with those of the British, American, German and other schools in Israel and Jordan. Textual criticism owes much to Père Lagrange's volume *La Critique Textuelle* and to the Greek New Testaments edited by Vogels, Merk and Bover, but our scholars have not, so far, produced critical editions of the Septuagint as a whole (though Dr J. Ziegler's editions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other books have been warmly praised), of the Massoretic text, or of the Syriac Peshitto. In the department of Semitic philology there are some great names, such as those of Père Vincent Scheil, O.P., first decipherer of Hammurabi's code, PP. Deimel, S.J., and Witzel. O.F.M., best known for their many studies in Sumerian, and P. Zorell, S.J., the editor of the *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti*, but much more remains to be done. Luckily, our biblical schools in Rome, Jerusalem and some other centres have plenty of students of many nationalities, and the number of reviews devoted to Holy Scripture has grown sensationally during the past twenty-one years. The American Catholic Biblical Association alone has some hundreds of members, most of them men who have been through the full training laid down by the Papal *Motu Proprio* of 1924 as a necessary requirement for teaching Scripture in universities and theological colleges. Whether or not it is true that a great renewal of interest in the scholarly treatment of the Bible was inaugurated by the publication of Renan's *Vie de Jesus* in 1863, we may look back over the last century with gratitude for the past, as we look forward with confidence to the future

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

Eight Propositions against the Prevailing Narrowness in Theology

I WISH to propound here an argument which can be summed up in eight propositions and which exposes the narrowness of contemporary British theology, especially regarding the attitude to religious experience. Although the eight propositions are evidently true, I shall concede to the confusion and obscurity of much present-day thinking the compliment of considering briefly objections to these eight propositions. The argument is as follows:

1. Unreflective theology is lifeless and hardly meets the needs of the intelligent layman.

2. To be reflective, theology must give some account of the grounds of religious truth.

3. But a defence of religion which is a mere appeal to revelation is spurious.

4. Yet natural theology provides merely feeble support for religion.

5. Therefore, religious truth can mainly be tested on the basis of religious experience (together with historical evidence).

6. But, if we are reflective, we cannot simply appeal to Christian experience (or history, for that matter).

7. Consequently, the study of religions is an indispensable framework for philosophizing about religion and for the validating of theology.

8. This conclusion is in marked contrast to the narrow purview of most present-day British theology.

Regarding (1) it may be objected that:

Obj. 1. i. It is simply the duty of the theologian to discover the truth about the Christian revelation and to expound it. But it may be replied that so far the Christian revelation is merely an *alleged* revelation. What are the grounds for accepting it? Personal experience? Historical evidence? As for the former, this is dealt with below. And as for historical evidence, it may yield strange events and yet not entail (without certain criteria and presuppositions) Christian conclusions. Thus the theologian is compelled to scrutinize his criteria and presuppositions. But this is a matter of reflection, and must be able to stand up to reasonable questioning by laymen.

Regarding (2), it may be objected that:

Obj. 2. i. We cannot judge God, and so we cannot judge God's revelation (which is God revealing himself). But the main ground for this objection is that our presumption in judging is blasphemous and that we are setting ourselves above God. But blasphemy is lack of proper humility before God, and it can hardly count as *this* to assert that God is overwhelmingly holy and deserving of humble obedience. Yet this latter is a truth-judgment about God.

Obj. 2. ii. There are no "grounds" of religious truth, for this latter has to be experienced and is not a matter of adducing grounds. But daffodils have to be experienced, and the discriminating of something as a daffodil has its grounds: we can give reasons for saying that something is a daffodil.

Obj. 2. iii. "Grounds" are useless, for human reason is fallen. But this latter claim is part of religious truth (supposedly) and grounds have to be adduced for saying it. So either this objection involves a vicious circle or it is overtly irrationalistic. Both alternatives are unacceptable—the first for obvious reasons and because it reduces to the second, and the second for reasons which are obvious once we contemplate the third proposition.

Regarding (3), it may be objected that:

Obj. 3. i. In the present state of human knowledge, any other

appeal than to revelation is out of the question. To this it can be replied by exposing the absurdity of the exclusive appeal to revelation (whether this be made in a fundamentalist manner or not) or indeed to any authority by itself. For this appeal can equally well be made by the Mormon or the Muslim or the Hindu, if they care to. But so what? God chooses to reveal himself to whomsoever he chooses, and the fact that Muslims appeal (wrongly) to the Koran is irrelevant. Yet the proposition "God chooses to reveal himself, etc." is part of revealed truth (or expresses something of revealed truth), and so we are in a circle again, though spuriously pretending to be out of it. In any case, how do we judge who has the revelation and who does not? If there is no way, then there is no reason for supposing that a Buddhist or an atheist is any less Christian than a Christian (and I am not speaking here of being Christian simply in the sense of "acting in accordance with Christian ideals"). But this reduces apologetics and theology to absurdity. But if there is a way of judging, then the appeal is not merely to revelation alone.

Further, irrationalism suits the atheist just as much as the Christian (consider the existentialists).

Again, if there were but one proposed body of revealed truth (possibly with minor variations), then the simple appeal to revelation might work. For it seems most plausible in the context of cultural tribalism, where the issue is between religion (identified in this instance with the Christian religion) and agnosticism or atheism. For it might be argued: Either you understand religion or you do not, and to understand you have to believe; so you must believe, and then you will see what religion is all about—there is no other way of gaining access to this sphere of experience save by accepting revelation (or by "being revealed to"). To this it may be replied that there are many (rather different sorts) of putative revelations and that the Hindu, for instance, often has spiritual insight—at least he understands something of "what religion is all about". Consequently it does not follow that it is either a matter of accepting the Christian revelation or of being blind about religion.

Again, the simple appeal to revelation is an implicit rejection of the idea of criteria of truth. But where there are no criteria we cannot even speak of truth.

Obj. 3. ii. Basically, religion must involve appeal to revelation, since ordinary folk and even clever people are not prophets and teachers. This objection is correct, but does not establish what it sets out to show. The fact that it is not the theologian's (or anyone else's) business to give revelations and the fact that here we have to be humble and conservative do not entail that there are not criteria for judging the truth of revelations. Similarly, a critic can make judgments about works of art even though he does not pretend to create works of art.

Regarding (4), it may be objected that:

Obj. 4. i. The traditional theistic arguments, taken together, give us an assurance of the existence of God. But even if they be accepted as conjointly valid (a doubtful concession since a conjunction of bad

arguments would not normally be better than the constituents of the conjunction), they—or similar ones—have been used to establish the existence of Brahman. And again, very damaging criticisms of them have been produced by philosophers—so much so that theologians (under the spell of the slogan "Either Reason or Revelation") have therefore retreated into irrationalism.

Regarding (5), it may be objected that:

Obj. 5. i. The trichotomy of natural theology, simple appeal to revelation and appeal to religious experience is not exhaustive. For example, there is historical evidence. But this has been dealt with above (*Obj. 1. i*) and has been mentioned in the bracketed qualification to Proposition 5. Again, what other serious candidate is there? Furthermore, God is a living God, i.e. one who appears in men's lives. A merely metaphysical or historical God who never showed himself would never be the mainspring of religion as we know it. And again, enlightened appeals to revelation (i.e. those that are not crudely fundamentalist) involve the recognition of revelation as something which happens in people's experience.

Obj. 5. ii. The word "experience" is vague and unhelpful. Agreed, it is vague. But clearly there are occasions, investigated by the phenomenologists of religion, when men claim to have religious experiences, and these are often of the profoundest importance in understanding the spiritual life. It is largely on the basis of these that men come to gain a deeper understanding of doctrines and of the history intertwined with doctrines.

Regarding (6), it may be objected that:

Obj. 6. i. Other religions fall short of Christianity, and therefore are merely of secondary significance. But this is to beg a lot of questions and itself enshrines a value-judgment presumably based mainly upon experience. But how can one base such a judgment upon experience without giving a fair consideration to religious experience as a whole?

Again, the appeal to history is insufficient without scrutinizing our presuppositions about history (e.g. the notion that God reveals himself in history). But it is not simply a matter of taking a religious view as against a secular one, for some important religious views—e.g. that of the Hindus—diverge notably from the Judaeo-Christian conception. Moreover, the question of the uniqueness of Christ has to be examined against this background.

Obj. 6. ii. We are not in a position to judge of the religious experience of those outside the Christian community. This is implausible, for conversions from one religious community to another often occur. Again, Christians usually consider it reasonable to criticize the doctrines of other religions on the basis of Christian experience. This would be presumptuous and impertinent if it were thought that the adherents of other faiths had experiences which were utterly incapable of being understood by Christians. And again, common sense shows the large degree to which one can gain a sympathetic understanding of, say, Hindu scriptures by reading them intelligently and (in a way) reverently. Again, if the objection were

true, the comparative study of religions ought to be abandoned as ridiculous, and no reasonable man would wish to suggest this.

Regarding (7), it may be objected that:

Obj. 7. i. We cannot be good at everything, and who can hope to be a specialist at once in Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, etc.? But it can be replied that everything, to the academic mind, can become "a vast subject in itself" (e.g. the history of Christian liturgy is "a vast subject in itself"). Yet such scholarly purism should not prevent the theologian from being intelligent and well-informed about a vital area of human experience. Again, theologians sometimes consider the relations between science and religion without supposing that it is necessary for this task to be a research physicist, etc.

Obj. 7. ii. Our forefathers got on perfectly well without worrying about Buddhism. Most of the Fathers and Saints of the Church were innocent of such knowledge. But they were innocent too of evolutionary theory and *Formgeschichte*: yet these modern developments of human inquiry cannot be ignored by the Twentieth Century Christian. Indeed, they certainly affect his theological views.

Obj. 7. iii. Such reflection, against the background of the great religions, though theoretically important, according to the present argument, has little practical significance in the Christian life. But first, much theological investigation, though demanded by the intellect, has little immediate pastoral application (consider, e.g., early English Church history). And second, a large number of intelligent laymen are becoming interested in the great non-Christian religions (the Church in this country seems to be hardly aware of book sales). This neo-protestantism—a religious, rather than Christian, protestantism, where the protestant is interested in ridding religion of what he regards as formalism and in going back to what he considers the essentials of religion—is a force to be taken account of even in the British suburbs.

Furthermore, the non-Christian faiths are very much alive and multitudinously supported in the non-European world which now so powerfully impinges upon us.

Regarding (8), it may be objected that:

Obj. 8. i. Theologians are well aware of these issues. But this is patently false and can be illustrated in two ways. First, the provision for acquainting students of theology with the background in the phenomenology of religion required for a balanced and reflective regard for these problems is ludicrously slight. Not only do few theological degrees in this country require the comparative study of religions, but sometimes it is regarded as a Cinderella subject which the teacher can mug up one jump ahead of the students. Second, very few theologians, in their apologetic and other pronouncements, even though they appeal often to religious experience in terms of "encounter", "the I-Thou relationship", etc., display in their writings any real awareness of the "encounters" of Hindus, Jains, Buddhists and so forth. Only a handful of scholars in this country (the foremost a Roman Catholic) are saying anything about the phe-

nomenology of religious experience in a manner relevant to the wider issues of apologetic. (And meanwhile many intelligent folk are avidly reading the Buddhist scriptures.)

These remarks are much more than an appeal for a sensible view of a particular field of inquiry. The whole argument points to something more profound—the narrowness of theological studies as they are often conceived in this country. In brief, theologians must philosophize in a more clear-headed manner, and doing this involves, among other things, a consideration of the wider field of religious experience. The days of cultural tribalism are over; and the current retreat into specialism and an esoteric language should be repudiated. Otherwise, theology will deserve the disdain which so often, in the outside world, is its present lot.

NINIAN SMART.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Michael Hocking is Vicar of St Ambrose's Church, East Bristol.

The Rev. Kenneth Skelton is Rector of Walton, Liverpool.

Mgr Barton is a former President of the Society of Old Testament Study and was Chairman of the Catholic Biblical Association from 1942 to 1957.

Mr Smart is a Lecturer in Philosophy at King's College, London.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIN AND INFANT BAPTISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

With apologies for the appearance of dogmatism, I cannot do more than comment briefly upon your correspondents' letters without undue demands upon your space.

So far from regarding Mr J. K. Byrom's practice as nonsense, I think it the best that can be done in present circumstances. I should go further and say that "without the Christian home background" of infant baptism we are not "getting perilously near to magic" but have got to it. Yet the B.C.P. imperatively requires the baptism of infants. This is the difficulty which the admittedly great change I support (I am surprised that anyone can think it an original proposal) alone can solve. But the trouble about representing baptism as reception into a covenant by which all future sins are to be forgiven is that it involves a radical departure from the view of the N.T. and of the early Church, for which whether there could be *any* forgiveness for sin after baptism was a problem.

I do not know what "theological textbooks" Mr Hugh Levinge reads if he thinks it a commonplace that their writers prefer the term "original guilt" to "original sin". Such Anglican theologians as are known to me refer to the former utterly immoral notion only to

repudiate it and to show that St Paul did not hold it. It derives from St Augustine.

That there is "no shred of evidence that man was ever perfect, free from sin, disease and death" is not "a most unscientific argument from silence" but a statement of verifiable fact from all that we know of man and of his history. It is the claim that it was ever otherwise that is (I do not say an argument but) baseless dogmatic assertion. I admit it cannot be *proved* to be untrue; but it is sufficient ground for not believing a proposition that there is no ground or reason why one should believe it. Nor do I know of any ground or reason why what some may "dredge from the folk-lore of the People of God" (are not all human beings his people?) should be accorded a status on which it can over-ride modern knowledge, still less the status of "revealed religious truth". By what light does anyone "dredge" it if not that of modern knowledge? Only by the much more inadequate knowledge of past ages.

I have been familiar with the argument that if one does not believe this, then one cannot believe that, and therefore cannot believe something else, for forty years. It is factually false and otherwise dangerous. One knows that it does sometimes so happen; but for every one who loses faith in this way, a thousand repudiate all religious belief because they erroneously think they are required to believe what is irreconcilable with modern knowledge. If modern knowledge is nothing but "shifting hypotheses" and "flimsy ground", what reason is there for thinking that the less adequate knowledge of past ages was more secure?

Modern knowledge is far from being complete, and to Mr Arthur Watling I would reply that I neither said nor implied that *all* that forms the inheritance of the self-conscious moral person is physically or racially acquired. But whatever the infant organism owes to his pre-natal stage or at the subconscious level, and whether this prompts to righteousness or to sin, he is born with the capacity to be influenced by *both*, and finds it as inheritance when he attains the status of a self-conscious moral person. No one should study modern psychology who has not studied "genetic" psychology—the growth of the knowledge process, which would inhibit the assumption that modern psychology's own delimited field of study could "explain" everything. The psychologist who knows little else is a menace. I do not deny the importance of the subconscious, but I am sceptical of it as a kind of bottomless pit in which the origin of all that is mysterious is to be found.

Yours faithfully,

J. S. Bezzant.

St John's College,
Cambridge.

EPISCOPACY AND INTERCOMMUNION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

"Is eucharistic doctrine and practice so irrelevant to the ques-

tion of intercommunion as all that?" Canon Balmforth's question seems to presuppose that I hold that it is. On the contrary, I would agree with him that it is highly relevant. A real measure of agreement that we are "doing the same thing" is clearly a *sine qua non* of any kind of intercommunion. I myself made it plain, I hope, that in breaking a common loaf which corresponds to no spiritual reality we merely eat judgment to ourselves. And I would agree that doctrinal issues must be taken very seriously in trying to assess in any given situation whether it is more sinful to break one Bread together than not to do so. Lutherans and Calvinists have indeed taken these issues so seriously as to refuse intercommunion on differences of doctrine alone. Anglicans, with their wide diversity of eucharistic doctrine, are hardly in a position to insist that we shall all believe the same thing before we can take Communion together. Divergences of belief clearly admit of degree, like every other element of sinfulness in our divided state. But obviously there *are* areas of ecumenical co-operation (for instance, between Methodists and Anglicans) where, in most peoples' judgment at any rate, doctrinal disagreement cannot be advanced as a decisive objection. It is in these cases, and where all the other conditions of intercommunion are present, that I was advocating concelebration as a temporary measure for overcoming the absolute veto upon any further progress which is at present allowed to be imposed by the need for episcopal ordination. Of course, concelebration (or any other form of intercommunion) implies the mutual recognition by each participating Church of the other as a real part of the Body of Christ and its ministries as ministries of Christ and effective means of grace. But in the light of the consistent statements of the Lambeth Conference, reiterated in the Report of the Anglican-Methodist Conversations, that this is acknowledged of the historic Free Churches of this country, no Anglican who takes this seriously and acts upon it can be accused of disloyalty.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN WOOLWICH.

17 MANOR WAY,
BLACKHEATH, S.E.3.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Bishop of Rochester draws our attention to the Lambeth report of 1930 in a quotation which seems hard to understand. What does the phrase "spiritual reality" mean? Is there perhaps another reality which episcopal ministers have? Such phrases presuppose a philosophy which would be difficult to defend. They lead to a suspicion on the part of many that the Lambeth bishops, not only in 1930, wish to elevate the question of order and re-union into the philosophical ionosphere where words may have a Humpty Dumpty meaning.

Another difficulty arises in this short passage if it is interpreted

by the following quotation from Lambeth 1920, for we find that the test of this spiritual reality lies in the effectiveness of the ministry as a means of grace. Here we appear to have another meaning of the word "ministry".

A man may have what appears to all to be a successful ministry in his first parish or cure; in his second he may be an obvious failure, but the reality of his ordination or appointment is surely the same in both places. To judge a man's orders by the way his parish responds is what Bishop Butler might have called "a very horrid thing". It leads to the conclusion that all acts of God are only real acts if we respond to them, and worse, the reality depends on the response of those ministered to, not on the man ministering.

When we try in charity to escape the cold clarity of traditional terminology, we lay ourselves wide open to the charge in Bishop Newbiggin's article in THEOLOGY, June 1958, of "lack of candour". We have discussed re-union from many angles, is it possible that we should consider our philosophical pre-suppositions? Is not the work done by the modern, so-called Oxford, school of linguistic philosophy calling those working for Christian unity to delve deeper than mere theological dictionaries and grapple with the meaning of even the simple words we all use in sermon and document, like "reality"?

Yours faithfully,

C. H. HUGGILL.

DELAMERE RECTORY,
NORTHWICH.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The continuing correspondence in your Journal on "Episcopacy and Intercommunion" encourages me to bring forward a related question which has been worrying me for some time, and to which I see no clear answer. I hope that by airing it some light will be thrown on it. The question in a nutshell is whether the spiritual effectiveness of orders is not more important than their validity.

This question is suggested by the Report of the Committee on Church Unity of the Lambeth Conference, 1958, where we read:

> It is the Committee's opinion that the Anglican Churches ought to be ready to recognize the Presbyterian Churches as true parts of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and that the spiritual effectiveness of their ministerial orders ought not to be implicitly or explicitly questioned. (2. 43.)

The meaning of spiritual effectiveness is elaborated in a passage of *The Apostolic Ministry* (p. 37):

> The problem of the validity or otherwise of non-episcopal ministries is a pressing one simply because in the matter of behaviour they produce results such as the validly ordained minister ought to produce. By their instrumentality men and women are converted, brought to acknowledge the supremacy of God and the truths of redemption, led to penitence, renewal of life, thanksgiving, prayer, worship, self-discipline, and the practice of the Christian virtues. They are spiritually edifying or efficacious.

A partial answer to my question is given by the same writer, K. E. Kirk, a little later (p. 39):

> However efficacious an invalid ministry may be, its invalidity will prevent its having the full efficacy which is possible to that which is valid.

Now in England this argument seems to hold, since the Church of England is, by and large, more effective spiritually than the Nonconformists. But in Scotland—and I write as a Scotsman and a priest of the Episcopal Church, though ordained in London—things are different, and the argument becomes irrelevant. As I see it, trying to be impartial, the Church of Scotland, despite many weaknesses, is much more spiritually effective than the Episcopal Church; its average is above our average, and its best men are far ahead of ours.

Why then do we make so much fuss about having valid orders? Validity does not guarantee spiritual effectiveness, and spiritual effectiveness seems to be what matters. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Yours faithfully,
W. Montgomery Watt.

The Neuk, Bridgend,
Dalkeith, Midlothian.

PASTORAL REORGANIZATION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The Rev. J. H. B. Andrews' letter in your December issue is so full of wisdom that it is almost an impertinence to praise it. I appreciate in particular his suspicion of the specialist in holy orders and his esteem for the all-rounder, which you would expect of an experienced country parson.

I have recently been re-reading the diaries of Parson Woodforde and of the Rev. B. J. Armstrong. East Dereham in Norfolk, where Armstrong was vicar from 1850 till 1888, is only nine miles from Weston Longeville, where Woodforde was rector from 1772 to 1803. I have discovered a link between the two men. Armstrong, in 1854, visited an aged parishioner who could remember old Mr Thomas, the last Vicar of Dereham to wear a full-bottomed wig. Mr Thomas was a friend of Parson Woodforde's in the 1780s, and they often exchanged visits. Apart from this link, what a gulf is fixed between the two diarists! How Armstrong despised the clergy of Woodforde's generation! And yet I find myself beginning to applaud the late Victorian clergy rather less and to admire the long despised eighteenth-century clergy rather more.

We all know what were the achievements of the clergy in the second half of the nineteenth century (and so did they themselves!). But we must not be so dazzled by their achievements that we forget that something was also lost to them in the seventy years that fol-

lowed Keble's Assize Sermon—a fact which did not escape the notice of Archbishop Thomson of York, according to his latest biographer, Dr Kirk-Smith. A certain naturalness in his relations with the rest of the community is conspicuous in the pages of Parson Woodforde's diary. It is not so conspicuous in Mr Armstrong's: though, to be fair, Armstrong was a grand man and a first-class parish priest.

Parson Woodforde judged his bishop and his fellow clergy simply as men. Into Armstrong's judgments ecclesiastical partisanship entered in. Woodforde did not make a hard and fast line between those who came to church regularly and those who didn't. He was interested in, and at home with everybody: with Squire Custance and his fashionable, but charming, wife, and their attractive children: with Richard Buck and Nathaniel Hathers and the other poor old men whom he entertained on Christmas Day every year at the rectory: with William Bidewell and John Girling and the rest of those cheerful, perspiring farmers who enjoyed, and sometimes rather overdid, the rector's hospitality on the evening of the tithe audit: with Betsy Davey and the other bright young things in the neighbourhood: with poor Mary Deecker the cripple girl whom he visited faithfully until the day of her death: with all and sundry, the grand and the not so grand, he was perfectly at ease. That is the Something which not all the clergy of subsequent generations have shared with him.

I ask a question all the more freely because no one these days will take any notice of it. Supposing a bishop were to say to his his next batch of deacons: "Forget all your bright ideas: forget the experts who gave the pastoralia lectures at college: forget even 'Parish and People' and baptismal reform: and for two years go to a country parish. Don't ask anyone to come to church: don't breathe a word about Christian Stewardship: don't accuse people of having a Defective Sense of the Church (for you can be certain they have). But just spend your time getting to know people really well. Interest yourselves in their interests: be as concerned about Mavis' prospects in G.C.E. as her mother is: in Gran's rheumatism: in Dad's runner beans. And when you can express your concern in a practical, helpful way, do so. And then after two years I will move you into as big a town parish as you wish; and you can have your Parish Communions, your Wells Scheme, your liturgical experiments and what you like." Would we have a more effective ministry than we have at the moment?

What a mistake we clergy make in thinking (if we do) that our first objective is to get people to church. If they have never had any previous contact with the Christian Faith there is absolutely no reason why they should go to church until they have learnt from us the mystery, and that may take them years. If our first approach to people is to ask them to come to church next Sunday or, even worse, to pop a freewill offering envelope under their noses, it is possible they will suspect (quite unfairly) that it is our vanity that makes us want to fill the pews, or mere professional ambition, such as one would expect in an actor or in the managing committee of a county cricket club which has to keep an eye on the gate. The England of

today is very different from Parson Woodforde's, but we have something to learn from him. He did not put up barriers between himself and the people, because when he went to see them they knew he had come because he really cared for them.

It was, of course, very remiss of him to give up so much time to fishing in the river Wensum, to coursing a hare in Weston Field, and to those hilarious parties at Mattishall and Hockering. But I suspect that he had something about him which was very well worth having and which many of Mr Armstrong's contemporaries conspicuously lacked. He was natural in his appproach: he was unhurried: he was completely unselfconscious. Mr Armstrong, with all his great qualities, had within him the beginnings of that clerical self-consciousness which has marred the pastoral work of many good, conscientious clergymen for the last hundred years.

F. H. West,
Archdeacon of Newark.

The Red House,
Ranskill,
Retford.

ELDERS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In his letter (December 1959) Dr Mascall makes the valuable point that the transplantation of the office of Elder from a Presbyterian to an Anglican climate is a much more delicate and complicated operation than the Rev. C. M. Ballard (November 1959) would have us believe. But Dr Mascall seriously lacks his usual discrimination when he lets Professor Geddes MacGregor lead him to think of the Eldership as something "avowedly optional" in Presbyterian theory and practice.

Considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed within the Church of Scotland with the Joint Report's account of the Eldership, and it has become evident that the nature of the Eldership is something requiring serious historical and theological study as a major problem of Church Order. Mr Ballard urges immediate consideration of "the proposal that the Church of England should accept *lay elders* into its system" (my italics) in precisely the terms that have proved controversial in a Church which at present possesses the office of Elder.

Professor Geddes MacGregor's views on the place of the Eldership in Presbyterianism, as quoted by Dr Mascall, are demonstrably at odds with large parts of the history, law, and current practice of the Church of Scotland, and to accept them as typical, as Dr Mascall seems to do, is to err in fact. Professor MacGregor has also simply begged the profoundly theological question which is now being asked in the Church of Scotland, the question of what God has done in raising up the office of Elder in the Reformed Churches.

That question can be distinguished fairly sharply from the question of the service of laymen in the Church, and will, I believe, be found to concern the Anglican understanding of the office of Deacon rather than that of the proper ministry of laymen. It may well pose some searching questions in this connexion that will soon dispel the lamented Anglican apathy regarding Elders!

It would obviously be premature for either of the Anglican Churches concerned to implement the recommendation of the Joint Report as to the introduction of Elders, before the Church of Scotland has concluded its theological re-appraisal of the office—a process which will be followed with particularly keen interest by many in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Yours faithfully,
R. T. Halliday.

St Andrew's Episcopal Church,
St Andrews.

BOOK REVIEWS

Cyril Forster Garbett, Archbishop of York. By Charles Smyth. Hodder and Stoughton. 1959. 35s.

Towards the end of 1937 the late William Paton, who was secretary of the International Missionary Council, said to me that he wanted to get the Bishop of Winchester to its Conference at Tambaram outside Madras the following year, precisely because he was one of the strong personalities of the Church of England, so thoroughly Anglican indeed that he had never stepped beyond its borders or, indeed, outside England except for holidays. In spite of the fact that Garbett disliked conferences, Paton was successful. Garbett made his mark at Tambaram, and Tambaram made its mark on Garbett. From that time until the end of his life he became a great traveller and ambassador of his Church, visiting all parts of the Anglican Communion and also going to other countries, and in war-time to the serving forces. Of these journeys he kept a full record. He prepared for them carefully, did not spare himself during them and enjoyed them enormously, even when towards the end of his life they were physically exhausting.

Garbett was a shy man who did not wear his heart on his sleeve; but on these journeys, with their varied encounters and changing scenes, he was entirely at his ease and forthcoming. Public appearances and public speaking had no terrors for him. He was an accomplished speaker who knew what he wished to say and how he wished to say it. It is said—a legend probably, true to type though maybe not true in fact—that when he toured the U.S.A. and in Canada, he left a copy of all his more important addresses behind in this country before he set out.

All this interesting phase of Garbett's life and work, well told in the biography, illustrates a notable feature of his long life—namely

the way in which he grew and developed, taking on new interests and developing latterly new and unsuspected traits like a sense of humour and even of playfulness.

Another notable element in the story was the progress from a none too promising beginning with uncertain health, to the splendid climax in his seventies. Never a man perfected more fully such talents and gifts as were given him. His record of achievement as administrator, pastor, speaker, and in his last years as a writer, is impressive in sheer quantity. From early days he set himself an exacting standard of self-discipline in prayer, reading and work, and lived by a strict time-table to the end. He never wasted time and would not allow anyone to waste his time if he could help it. He was not made hesitant by doubts concerning the ultimate verities, or confused by a complicated psychology. He was direct and simple, and he was of the few who could be angry without letting the sun go down upon his wrath. Direct and simple himself, he had a keen scent for humbug and duplicity, and he hated the lie.

These are indeed marks of greatness and his biographer gives them with unconcealed admiration their full due.

What was Garbett's contribution to the thought and councils of the Church? A quite devastating, and often inspired common sense. He never became airborne as happens sometimes to prophets, nor was he tempted to embark on rash enterprises as reformers sometimes are. Indeed, I would hardly account him a prophet or a reformer, strictly speaking. For most of his life he was neither before his time nor behind it. He was contemporary, and voiced clearly and cogently what many churchmen were thinking. He spoke and wrote strongly about Church reform, but rather surprisingly he did not exert his practical ability to overcome the *vis inertia* in the Church. Similarly, while he hit out against social injustice, cruelty and vice, and made powerful and well-documented speeches on housing, he did not diagnose the deeper causes of the malaise of Western society or see the need for radical re-thinking as Temple did. Fundamentally he was not unhappy with the status quo. Here his biographer has been inclined to accept these limitations uncritically.

Two events in Garbett's life, one crucial, the other transient though typical, were of special interest to me. The curious threesome which Cosmo Ebor, Randall Cantuar and he played in the Goole versus Portsea match (pp. 84–97) throws an uncertain light on the subject of Guidance. In spite of the fact of which he told me when we spent a day in Goole ten years ago that he had got as far as measuring up for curtains and carpets, the decision to withdraw his acceptance in favour of Portsea was in the climate of the age inevitable.

The other event was his visit to Sheffield in 1953 to give four addresses on the Christian faith to a great company of church-folk from the parishes of the diocese. He packed all sorts of doings into the other hours of the day but spoke each night for an hour with great conviction. What impressed me most was not merely their

lucidity and spiritual force, but also their freshness—quite remarkable in a man of his years—and the signs in them of extensive and down-to-date reading.

Archbishop Garbett indeed reversed the process that often happens in the lives of ecclesiastics. In his early days he lived and worked well within the Church society, but at the end, without any loss of sanctity, he was much more aware of the secular world. And because he understood and shared the concerns of industrial men of the North and political men in Parliament he had their ear and their admiration.

Canon Smyth has put us in his debt for using so judiciously the ample material at his disposal and for bringing out the many facets of the long life of a Christian man who so clearly served Church and people with a fine integrity and devotion.

LESLIE SHEFFIELD.

AN OUTLINE OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. By Th. C. Vriezen. Translated by S. Neuijen. Blackwell. 42s.

Professor Vriezen devotes nearly a third of his book to an introduction in which he discusses the exact nature of Old Testament theology. This he distinguishes quite clearly from the religion of Israel. Old Testament theology is something which must be culled from the belief of Israel at different times and periods of development as recorded in the Old Testament; but at the same time the Old Testament itself is written to some extent from a single theological viewpoint, as much of it was edited between 750 and 500 B.C. by men under the influence of the prophetic movement, who themselves passed judgment on the material they edited. This, in Vriezen's view, was all to the good, as it makes immediate communion between man and God the underlying idea of the Bible, the prophetic experience of communion with God being accepted as the most important form of revelation. Religious ideas in Israel which belong to the general pattern of Middle Eastern religion are of little importance and can be discounted, as it is revelation that matters. (Theology is "the thought of faith springing from revelation".) In deciding what elements in the Old Testament writings are truly revelatory, Vriezen frankly writes from a Christian standpoint. Christianity springs out of the Old Testament and is its natural fulfilment; though there are, Vriezen admits, strains in it which can lead, and have led, rather to Judaism. As a Christian he believes God had a plan of revelation, though the plan as a whole is known only to God.

One of the most interesting chapters in the introduction is that in which he discusses the use of the Old Testament in the Church (Chapter IV). For Christians, Christ is the author of the Old Testament as far as the revelation is concerned, but this does not absolve us from finding out the meaning of any passage *e mente auctoris* (i.e. the individual Old Testament writer), for it is for us to see

what of eternal truth God was conveying through each author, confused as it was with matter of less permanent worth. As regards authorship and dates, Vriezen writes from the point of view of "critical orthodoxy", perhaps even from that of a "conservative critical orthodoxy". He considers that the anti-monarchical account of the institution of the kingship is the original account (and not the result of later unhappy experience), and he lays severe strictures on at least one modern theory: "The so-called feast of the ascension of Yahweh to the throne is an unfounded modern hypothetical construction which is confusing rather than clarifying" (p. 183).

In the later part of the book, where he deals with the contents of Old Testament theology, pride of place goes, as we should expect, to the prophets, of whom Moses is held to be the first. But in a very interesting chapter he tries to show that the cultic law, as we have it now (particularly in Leviticus), itself bears witness to prophetic teaching. The different ways of manipulating the blood prescribed, on the one hand, in a whole burnt offering, and on the other, in a sin offering, are taken to reflect teaching about the need for God to take the first step (by accepting the blood) in restoring man when he has sinned, and though the present reviewer wonders whether quite so much can be made out of this material, Vriezen has a splendid culminating passage in which he shows that the Suffering Servant fulfils the truest ideals both of the prophets and (as a sacrifice) of the cultic law.

It is a pity that there is much which makes this book difficult to read. No one could imagine that it was written in English or translated by an Englishman, though we must admit that some of the words and phrases that jar most might have been perpetrated by some modern English writers. There is too much of such words as "phenomenological", "empirico-historical", "pedagogical", "dynamistic" and so forth. The coinage "Nazirate", the state of being a Nazirite, seems to be formed on the analogy of such words as episcopate. There are sentences which have to be read and read again before one can discover the meaning intended by the author. But there are also simple mistakes of translation, of which "penitence" for "penance" (p. 296) is the worst, and once we have the unexpected spelling "profetic". It would be unkind to draw attention to such blemishes merely for the sake of doing so, but as the volume is likely to be a standard work for some time, it is to be hoped that a further edition will appear thoroughly revised by an English scholar who understands Dutch.

London. E. L. Randall.

The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought. By Lindsay Dewar. Mowbray. 1959. 25s.

There are few more urgent theological tasks at the present time than that of relating the Christian theology of the Holy Spirit to modern psychological and sociological studies. In general the English mind has been slow to accept the theories and methods of these

new disciplines, and theology in particular has been hesitant to include within its system elements which may appear to be either mechanistic or irrational. Yet the Christian theologian cannot simply by-pass sciences which not only have established themselves academically but also are being increasingly presented in attractive ways to the popular mind.

It is the great merit of Canon Lindsay Dewar's book that it takes psychiatry seriously. He himself has engaged in psychiatric work at first-hand and is aware of the problems which arise in the field of group psychology. His main concern, therefore (and this appears explicitly in the third section of the book), is to enlarge our understanding of what he calls the *natural* operations of the Holy Spirit by reference to psychiatric practice and to give a modern interpretation of his *supernatural* operations by reference to psychological theories of the unconscious, of archetypal symbols, of identification and of the group mind. This explicit concern of the third section is not absent from the other two in which the author examines first the Biblical Doctrine and secondly the contributions of the Fathers, of Luther, Calvin, Hooker and Fox. But these earlier sections keep fairly closely to the linguistic and historical treatment of the doctrine such as is to be found in more conventional approaches and the really original contribution is reserved for the final part.

In this part there are interesting and constructive suggestions which are worthy of careful examination. I find the distinctions between natural and supernatural, conscious and unconscious, individual and corporate drawn more sharply than would appear to me to be possible or desirable. And I am not sure of the value of bringing the very uncertain results of E.S.P. investigation into this context. But I welcome particularly the sympathetic appraisal of the psychiatrist's work and the relation of psychological concepts to traditional terms used in speaking of the operations of the Holy Spirit.

There are, however, some aspects of the book about which I feel considerable difficulty. Much stress is laid upon the use of *personal* terms in referring to the Spirit. But nowhere do I find a thoroughgoing examination of the category of the personal. Is it, for example, desirable to speak of the Spirit as "a person" or " a separate person"? Before condemning the use of "impersonal" terminology it would have been helpful if the author had shown us more clearly his understanding of person and personal on the human level and how this is to be applied to the Divine Being.

Again a good deal of emphasis is laid upon Natural Law as if this were a self-explanatory concept. But few traditional terms are more in need of re-interpretation than this. And at times in the course of his writing the author seems almost to infer that any *individual* experience of the Spirit's activity is to be suspected if not condemned. Yet in his account of the Pentecostal outpouring he makes it clear that the experience was "intensely individual" though leading to a new sense of corporate fellowship.

What I regret most in the book is the polemical note which so

often recurs, especially in reference to Reformed theology. There is a legitimate place for theological disputation and we all have a duty to strive for the truth. But it is dangerous to accuse others of subjectivist exegesis and of reading their own theology into the texts they are expounding. They can easily retort that the one who makes the accusation may be doing the same. Certainly none of us can lay claim to a complete objectivity in the work of interpretation and to me at least it seems very clear that Canon Dewar has a cause to plead, a position to maintain, and that this can hardly fail to influence his own exegesis. Subjectivity in interpretation is surely not entirely reprehensible. Could not this be part of the work of the living Holy Spirit?

Whatever may be my disagreements on particular points I recognize that this book is the fruit of long study and meditation on the work of the Spirit. The Biblical and Historical sections gather together a great deal of useful material and the final section opens the way to new insights concerning the manner of the Spirit's operation.

F. W. Dillistone.

Liverpool.

Three Traditions of Moral Thought. By Dorothea Krook. Cambridge University Press. 1959. 30s.

This book consists of a series of studies of different writers. The argument, stated briefly, is that Plato and St Paul regard love (or virtue) as the essential factor in human relationships, and support their philosophies with the authority of a religious experience (this is the first tradition); that Aristotle, Hobbes and Hume take an altogether lower view of human nature and discard both love and religion for the purpose of analysing morals (the second tradition); and that there is a third approach which retains love but discards the religious sanction—an approach which finds expression in different ways in J. S. Mill, Matthew Arnold, F. H. Bradley and D. H. Lawrence (the third tradition). These last are the "Humanist" systems, which "imperfect and incomplete as they all are, have been shown to stand with the religious systems in affirming an order of goodness and power greater than any that the worldly world can show" (p. 295).

This is not the place to argue about Mrs Krook's "Christian Humanism"; indeed it would be impertinent to call into question the Humanist's experience that his is a satisfactory philosophy of life. But it is appropriate to point out that the authors she has chosen for these essays do not always support the conclusions she wishes to draw from them.

In the first place she has been very rash in bracketing Plato with St Paul in the same "religious tradition". In the *Gorgias* (which is the subject of Mrs Krook's essay on Plato), Socrates demonstrates that "injusticia" is a great evil both in the state and in the individual, and that therefore it is ultimately a misfortune to commit an injustice and get away with it; it is far better to pay the due penalty,

in order to be cured of what is really a diseased tendency to commit injustice. This is described by Plato as a "strange doctrine" in the eyes of those who believe that might is right; but it is not nearly so "strange" as Mrs. Krook makes it when she calls it a "near-Christian doctrine", and expands it to mean that "it is better to suffer injustice than to inflict it—what Socrates calls 'punishment', what Christians would call 'expiation' following on repentance, is a means of purification, a cleansing of the soul polluted by sin". Mrs. Krook has read a great deal into Plato if she believes that Plato had any notion of *redemptive* suffering, or of submission to injustice for its own sake. She appears to base her argument mainly on Socrates' speech about punishment in *Gorgias* 480d; but it is to be observed that the word "guilt" appears only in her paraphrase of this passage (p. 40) not in the original, and that there is no possible source in the Greek for her conclusion: "'Repent ye, that ye may be saved': this, in effect, is Socrates' message." (Indeed, this is explicitly contradicted in *Gorgias* 507d). Mrs Krook, in fact, contributes nothing which would lead one to reconsider Zeller's opinion that "the Platonic ethics like the Socratic is based absolutely on the autonomy of reason and is thus far completely independent of religion".

If Plato is discarded, only Paul is left to represent the "religious tradition". This means that the humanist writers with whom the second part of the book is concerned are not "on the side of the religious systems", they are the inheritors of one religion only, that is, Christianity. That is to say, they do not stand in a "religious tradition of moral thought" of which one member only, Christianity, is encumbered with supernatural sanctions. They are independent philosophical attempts to sift the moral gold of Christianity from its supernatural surroundings.

How far the great nineteenth-century attempts to do this were successful is a matter which one will judge according to one's own point of view. Mrs Krook's studies of Mill, Arnold and Bradley are sensitive and interesting, though one would question many of her statements about the Christianity which they were interpreting. But it is a pity that these are followed by a chapter on D. H. Lawrence, for in order to make him a spokesman of the same tradition at all, Mrs Krook has to offer us her own improved version of one of his stories; and this leads her to propound an aspect of her Humanism which we can only call obscurantist: "Humanism, like its predecessors in the central religious tradition of our civilization, is Messianic in character. It believes that the redemptive power of sexual love can be affirmed only by a single, individual Person, who shall proclaim it with the authority derived from his unique knowledge of its power to redeem, and shall thereby make the complete and perfect Word flesh for the final salvation of the world."

Mrs Krook makes frequent use of the word "redemptive", without ever stating precisely what she means by it. She believes that Christ's gospel of love has power to redeem and transform the world. Christians only believe in such a miracle because they can see God

at work in it. Mrs Krook believes in it without God, and there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of her belief. But it is important to see that Plato knew nothing of any "redeeming" power in the world and that St Paul, the Christian, is the only writer of those whom Mrs Krook discusses who gives us authority to believe that such a power exists.

A. E. Harvey.

Chelsea.

The Greek East and the Latin West. By Philip Sherrard. O.U.P. 1959. 25s.

Dr Philip Sherrard is already known as the author of a very interesting book on modern Greek poetry. His contrast is not so much between Greece and Rome, as between the Hellenistic civilization organized and diffused in the Roman empire, and an older tradition which found intellectual expression in the first Greek philosophers, in Plato and again in Neo-Platonism, and fulfilment in Byzantine Christendom. Possibly he exaggerates the direct influence of the secular education of Byzantine lawyers and civil servants on the theology of the monasteries and of the Church, and does not distinguish sufficiently between the different roles of studies in the same curriculum (derived from the schools of the Roman empire) in Byzantium, in the Latin West, and under Islam. But he is clear about the difference between this scholastic learning and theological wisdom. This "cannot be acquired . . . through mere learning and study, but only by means of an initiation through which the candidate is prepared, and put in a position to receive, stage by stage, and according to his or her capacity, spiritual understanding" (p. 28). "The revelation of the Truth in Christ is intimately linked to a method of its realization" (p. 112): "the formal discipline of the means of spiritual realization which are an essential part of any genuine religious tradition" (p. 194). It follows that, wherever the Christian mysteries are celebrated, there Christ is and the Church is, and at the deepest level, schism is impossible, but also that the most subtle differences in ways in which the doctrine of God's creation is conceived, not only determine differences in ecclesiastical order and the relations between Church and State, but colour the whole of life.

Dr Sherrard succeeds in demonstrating the intimate connexion between the scholastic doctrine of God and the idea of created grace, and between Greek patristic doctrine and another conception of the relation between God and creation. But he says nothing of eirenical interpretations of the *filioque* by some Byzantine writers, and very little of those Latin theologians who, on what he considers the main point at issue, "that the cause and principle of being in the Trinity is the hypostasis of the Father" (p. 69), agreed with the Greeks against others.[1] That Aquinas provided only a partial defence "against the

[1] E.g. Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate*, Book VI, c. 22.

development of a secular Aristotelianism" (p. 168), is an historical fact increasingly recognized even by those who believe his work to have been theoretically adequate. But in this defence he was assisted by new translations of Aristotle made in Greece during the Latin occupation. Of these Dr Sherrard does not seem to be aware. In his very illuminating account of the Platonic reaction in medieval Byzantium, he refers to the distinction made by Gemistos Plethon between Aristotle as physicist and as philosopher (p. 123). If this was already familiar to Byzantine Aristotelians, its influence on the West, could this be traced, might be important for the beginnings of experimental science. Dr Sherrard links this rather to Arabian Aristotelianism. In his concern to criticize the rationalism of the neoclassical revival in modern Greece, he develops what appears to be an anti-scientific bias. This to some extent runs through the whole book and conflicts with the experimental element in his approach to theology. It may be, however, more apparent than real. In a large survey of a very complex subject, errors of fact are few and not very important. (Julius II, not Pius II, was responsible for the "profane and vacuous character" of St Peter's, Rome.) In theological argument he is admirably lucid, often provocative, but unpolemical in tone. Theologians and historians have much to learn from his book.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

SHORTER NOTICES

GLIMPSES AND IMPRESSIONS OF KIERKEGAARD. Selected and translated by T. H. Croxall. Nisbet. 15s.

This posthumous book is the last contribution of Dr Croxall to Kierkegaard scholarship. It is in three parts: the Recollections of Hans Brøchner, 1871–2); extracts from "Recollections from Home", by Henriette Lund, the neice of Kierkegaard; and, finally, reports of the struggle of Kierkegaard with the Danish State Church, his last illness, death and funeral, together with documents illustrating his relations with his brother Peter and with his erstwhile fiancée, Regine Schlegel.

The book is a veritable treasure chest of exciting detail and information about this humorous, warm and lovable philosopher, misnamed "melancholy". Dr Croxall notes that *Tungsind* means "introspective and brooding" rather than "melancholy", and he goes on to state in his admirable foreword that one side of Kierkegaard's nature was introspective and brooding, but that the world saw a gay and vivacious personality. The short biography which precedes the "glimpses and impressions" is a useful and concise introduction to the details referred to in the documents. Part III of the series contains material which appears for the first time in English and this helps the reader to appreciate the attitude of Søren to his brother

Peter in the context of the wider issue of his attack upon the church. Each of the series of documents is prefaced by an introductory note which presents the author of the documents and enlarges on some of the details recorded in them. We must be grateful for a felicitous translation. The style is exactly suited to the presentation of a rich and vivid personality.

The writings of Kierkegaard are illuminated by a knowledge of the man himself. While we lament the passing of Dr Croxall from our midst, we are grateful to him for leaving us such a rich legacy in the shape of this book. It is a happy memorial to his dedicated scholarship.

G. H. WALDEN.

BRISBANE.

BOOK NOTES

The Faith Press has published *A Service for Good Friday Evening* (9d.), compiled by Patrick Cowley: it contains a sequence of readings, hymnody, and versicles and responses, and has been used for some years at St John's Church, Frome. Volume IX of the *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales* contains articles on "The Book of Llandav" by J. W. James, on "Border Priests" by E. J. L. Cole, on "St Asaph Episcopal Acts, 1536–1558" by G. M. Griffiths, and on "Cases of Subtraction of Church-Rate before the Consistory Courts of St David's" by W. T. Morgan. The first issue of the *Leicester Cathedral Quarterly*, January 1960 (1s. 6d.), contains an article by I. T. Ramsey on the centenary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. The January number of the quarterly review, *Moral Welfare* (9d.), which is so much more admirable than its title, has an interesting account of "The Midnight Meeting Movement", which was an attempt to rescue prostitutes that was started in 1860. *The Tablet* (2 January 1960) reports that "the diocese of Rome is said to need at least fifty new priests every year, but last year only fifteen were ordained and the number has several times in recent years been less than ten". The Coptic text of *The Gospel according to Thomas* with an English translation has now been published by Collins (18s.): for an account of it, see the article by G. C. Stead on "New Gospel Discoveries" in THEOLOGY, August–September 1959. A new edition of Traherne's "Centuries of Meditations" is much to be welcomed: it is entitled simply *Centuries* (Faith Press, 15s.), as was originally intended by Dobell whose text is here reissued. *The Worship of God* by M.-D. Philippe, O.P., and *Mary the Mother of God* by L.-J. Suenens are two new "Faith and Fact" books (Burns and Oates, 7s. 6d. each). Mr S. J. Forrest has produced a new book of humorous verse, entitled *Chapter and Verse* (Mowbrays, 7s. 6d.), which shows no abatement in his wit: there are illustrations by E. W. Forrest. The Society for Old Testament Study has published its *Book List 1959*, which contains short descriptions of all the books listed: copies, (6s., post free) may be obtained from Llansadwrn, Menai Bridge, Anglesey. The Archbishop of York's Lent book, entitled *The End of a Golden String*, is by Robert Nelson, late Bishop of Middleton (Faith Press, 5s.): it will appeal to those who appreciated Mr Townroe's article on prayer in last December's THEOLOGY. A new quarterly review of philosophy and theology, *The Heythrop Journal* (Blackwell, 35s. per annum), is to be welcomed.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON